HON'BLE SHRI G.S.SINGHVI, THE CHIEF JUSTICE
AND
HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE C.V. NAGARJUNA REDDY

WRIT PETITION No. 3334 OF 2001

Between:

R.M. Sampath Kumari

..... Petitioner

AND

The Chairman,
State Level Police Recruitment Board,
Hyderabad & another

.....Respondents

:: O R D E R ::

Counsel for the petitioner : Shri K. Venkatesulu

Dated: 26.12.2006

Per G.S.SINGHVI, CJ

In this petition, the petitioner has prayed for issue of a direction

to the respondents to consider her case for appointment as Additional Public Prosecutor.

Shri K. Venkatesulu, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner says that the writ petition has become infructuous and the same may be disposed of as such. Ordered accordingly.

As a sequel to disposal of the writ petition, W.P.M.P.Nos. 4270 and 4271 of 2001 filed by the petitioner for interim relief are dismissed.

G.S.SINGHVI, CJ

C.V. NAGARJUNA REDDY, J

26.12.2006
ksld

S.No.	W.P. No.	Corresponding W.P.No. in earlier litigation	Date of order in W.P.M.P. ordering status quo	Date of order in W.P.	Date of interim order in WAMP in Writ Appeal	Date of dismissal of W.A.
1)	17076/2000	5282 of 1993	23-4-93	3.6.94.	20.9.94	29.2.96
2)	17077/2000	5539 of 1993	28.4.93	-do-	-do-	-do-
3)	17078/2000	5327 of 1993	26.4.93	-do-	-do-	-do-
4)	17108/2000	5569 of 1993	28.4.93	-do-	-do-	-do-
5)	17109/2000	5540 of 1993	28.4.93	-do-	-do-	-do-

6)	17110/2000	6653 of 1993	19.5.93	25.3.96	No writ appeal	---

The above recapitulation of facts and tabular statement of the orders passed in different cases makes it clear that on account of the interim orders of status quo passed by this Court in the writ petitions filed by the appellants, respondent No.2 could not undertake the exercise for passing award in respect of Ac.11-96 cts. The last order of status quo was passed on 19-5-1993 in WPMP No.8430 of 1993 in Writ Petition No.6653 of 1993. That petition was finally dismissed on 25-3-1996 and the award was passed on 12-3-1998. Therefore, by virtue of the explanation appearing below Section 11A, the period during which the proceedings in furtherance of declaration made under Section 6 remained stayed is liable to be excluded in computing the period of two years specified in Section 11A.

In **Abhey Ram**'s case (supra), a three Judges Bench of the Supreme Court considered the question somewhat similar to the one raised in these appeals. The factual matrix of that case